



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/698,849	10/31/2003	Michal Morciniec	B-5283 621316-4	9307	
22879	7590	02/02/2010	HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY		
Intellectual Property Administration 3404 E. Harmony Road Mail Stop 35 FORT COLLINS, CO 80528			EXAMINER		
			DUNHAM, JASON B		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3625		
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE			
02/02/2010		ELECTRONIC			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM  
ipa.mail@hp.com  
laura.m.clark@hp.com

1                   UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
2  
3

---

4                   BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
5                   AND INTERFERENCES  
6

---

7  
8                   *Ex parte* MICHAL MORCINIEC, CLAUDIO BARTOLINI, ANDREW  
9                   ROBERT BYDE, CHRISTOPHER WILLIAM PREIST, and MATHIAS  
10                  JEAN RENE SALLE

---

11  
12                  Appeal 2009-007676  
13                  Application 10/698,849  
14                  Technology Center 3600  
15

---

16  
17                  Decided: January 29, 2010  
18  
19

---

20  
21                  *Before:* MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, HUBERT C. LORIN, and BIBHU R.  
22                  MOHANTY, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

23  
24                  CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge.*

25  
26                   DECISION ON APPEAL  
27  
28  
29  
30

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

2 Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a final rejection  
3 of claims 1 to 15, 17, and 19 to 27. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C.  
4 § 6(b) (2002).

5 Appellants invented a method and apparatus for use in making a  
6 purchase decision regarding purchases of a plurality of units of goods or  
7 service from a plurality of different potential suppliers (Spec. 1).

8 Claim 1 under appeal reads as follows:

1. Apparatus for use in making a purchase decision regarding purchase of a plurality of units of a good or service at a particular purchasing time from a plurality of potential suppliers, the apparatus comprising means for determining or otherwise obtaining a total quantity of units of said good or service required to be purchased at said purchasing time as defined by one or more purchase orders relating to said purchasing time, means for accessing details of terms under which said good or service may be purchased from each of said potential suppliers at said purchasing time, and means for providing an indication of one or more consequences of allocating portions of said total quantity to be purchased among said plurality of potential suppliers.

25 The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on  
26 appeal is:

27 Hahn-Carlson US 2004/0010463 A1 Jan. 15, 2004

28 The Examiner rejected claims 17 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 101  
29 as reciting non statutory subject matter.

30 The Examiner rejected claims 1 to 15, 17, and 19 to 27 under 35  
31 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hahn-Carlson.

## ISSUE

2 Have Appellants shown that the Examiner erred in finding that Hahn-  
3 Carlson discloses a means for providing an indication of one or more  
4 consequences of allocating portions of said total quantity to be purchased  
5 among said plurality of potential supplier?

## FINDINGS OF FACT

8 The Examiner relies on paragraph [0050] of Hahn-Carlson for  
9 teaching means for providing an indication of one or more consequences of  
10 allocating portions of a total quantity to be purchased among said plurality  
11 of potential suppliers (Ans. 5).

12 Hahn-Carlson discloses an automated transaction processing system  
13 directed to communications and data processing involving the establishment  
14 and implementation of contracts [0002]. The Hahn-Carlson apparatus  
15 includes a Collaborative contracts manager (CCM) 210 which is adapted to  
16 search for contracts for a particular item offered by different sellers and to  
17 identify prices for purchase of the item by a particular buyer. Once eligible  
18 contracts are identified, a contract with the lowest price is selected and  
19 implemented. With this approach, a buyer can automatically have a lower-  
20 price eligible contract identified and implemented for purchasing products  
21 [0050].

## PRINCIPLES OF LAW

24 A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in  
25 the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior

1 art reference. *Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631  
2 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 484 U.S. 827 (1987).

3

#### 4 ANALYSIS

5 Statutory subject matter

6 The Examiner's answer includes a new ground of rejection under 35  
7 U.S.C. § 101 of claims 17 and 27. Our records indicate that Appellants have  
8 failed to respond to the new ground of rejection within two months from the  
9 date of the Answer. Accordingly, the appeal as to claims 17 and 27 is  
10 dismissed. *See* 37 C.F.R. § 41.39(b) (2009).

11

12 Anticipation

13 We will not sustain this rejection. We agree with the Appellants that  
14 Hahn-Carlson does not disclose a means for providing an indication of  
15 allocating portions of a total quantity to be purchased among a plurality of  
16 potential suppliers. While Hahn-Carlson does disclose a plurality of  
17 potential suppliers and compares prices from the plurality of suppliers,  
18 Hahn-Carlson does not disclose anything about allocating portions of a  
19 quantity to purchase among a plurality of suppliers. Rather, in Hahn-  
20 Carlson a purchaser selects a single supplier by comparing the prices of a  
21 plurality of suppliers. In view of the foregoing, we will not sustain the  
22 Examiner's rejection of claim 1 and claims 2 to 15 dependant thereon. We  
23 will also not sustain the rejection of claims 20 and 21 and claims 22 to 26  
24 dependent thereon because independent claims 20 and 21 recited similar

1 language to claim 1 regarding the allocation of a purchase among a plurality  
2 of suppliers.

3 We will sustain the rejection as it is directed to claim 19 because  
4 Appellants do not advance specific arguments related to claim 19 and claim  
5 19 does not recite any subject matter related to the allocation of a purchase  
6 among a plurality of suppliers.

7

#### 8 CONCLUSION OF LAW

9 On the record before us, Appellants have shown that the Examiner  
10 erred in rejecting claims 1 to 15 and 20 to 26. The Appellants have not  
11 shown that the Examiner erred in rejecting claim 19. The appeal as it is  
12 directed to claims 17 and 27 is dismissed.

13

#### 14 DECISION

15 The Examiner's rejection of claims 1 to 15 and 20 to 26 is sustained.  
16 The Examiner's rejection of claim 19 is not sustained.

17 No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with  
18 this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a). *See* 37 C.F.R.  
19 § 1.136(a)(1)(iv) (2007).

20

21 AFFIRMED-IN-PART

1 hh

2

3

4 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
5 Intellectual Property Administration  
6 3404 E. Harmony Road  
7 Mail Stop 35  
8 FORT COLLINS, CO 80528  
9

10

11

12

13